

6-18-1995

Resist Board Meeting, June 18, 1995

Resist

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/minutes>

Recommended Citation

Resist, "Resist Board Meeting, June 18, 1995" (1995). *Resist Board Meeting Minutes*. 245.
<https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/minutes/245>

A call to **RESIST** illegitimate authority

One Summer Street, Somerville, Massachusetts 02143
617/623-5110

Board Meeting - June 18, 1995 - 11am
Place: Louis Kampf's apartment
14 Glenwood Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139 / Tel.: (617)492-3468

Frank Brodhead
Pam Chamberlain
Connie Chan
Bell Chevigny
Noam Chomsky
Kate Cloud
Tess Ewing
Norm Fruchter
Larry Goldsmith
Mitchell Goodman
Kenneth Hale
Oscar Hernandez
Frank Joyce
Louis Kampf
Hans Koning
Paul Lauter
Nancy Moniz
Richard Ohmann
Wayne O'Neil
Carlos Otero
Grace Paley
Roxanna Pastor
Merble Reagon
Henry Rosemont
Tatiana Schreiber
Rena Scott
Cheryl Smith
Meredith Smith
Amy Swerdlow
Ken Tangvik
Rene Valle
George Vickers
Nancy Wechsler
White

Dear Board member,

For this meeting, we have 35 requests to consider which means we'll have \$21,000 for grants (\$600 x 35).

Please remember the Maximum grant is \$1,000 (but could be less); a Some grant is \$300; a Token grant remains at \$100; and emergency grants have been raised to \$200.

AGENDA

** Any last minute items of information by staff which are important.

EMERGENCY GRANTS

** A report on any emergency grants made between the May 1995 and this Board meetings.

GRANT REQUESTS

Community/Anti-racism

1) Overcoming Poverty Together (Mankato, MN) - A request of \$1,000 toward the purchase of a computer and to hire an organizer.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

2) Religion and Diversity Project (Burnsville, NC) - Requesting \$1,000 to purchase a fax machine, a photo copying machine and a computer printer.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

3) Centro Salvadoreno (Hempstead, NY) - Request of \$1,000 for a television and VCR for their Education & Outreach project.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

4) Institute for the Study of the Religious Right (Los Angeles, CA) - Asking for \$1,000 to pay staff time used in educational presentations to activist groups in California.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

5) Empty the Shelters - San Francisco (CA) - \$1,000 requested toward their leadership development training project for youth.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

6) The PLAN Committee (Jamaica Plain, MA) - Request of \$1,000 toward the expenses of the First Latino Community Leadership Conference on June 17.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

7) Border Rights Coalition (El Paso, TX) - Requesting \$1,000 to purchase a photo machine.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

Peace/Anti-militarism

8) Citizen Soldier (New York, NY) - A request of \$1,000 for the expenses of producing a special issue of the newspaper, On Guard.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

9) Veterans for Peace (Minneapolis, MN) - Asking for \$1,000 for a laser printer.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual

10) Human Rights Project (Kansas City, MO) - \$850 requested for the expenses production and mailing costs of a membership recruitment brochure for the gay and lesbian community.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

11) Rural Concerns Consortium (Danville, NH) - Asking for \$1,000 to create a central office to facilitate communication between rural gay and lesbian organizations and activists.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

12) Children of Lesbians & Gays Everywhere (San Francisco, CA) - They're requesting \$1,000 to purchase a photo copying machine.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

Media/Culture

13) Arkansas Broadcasting Foundation (Little Rock) - Asking for \$800 to purchase field recording equipment to train members of groups fighting for social and economic change.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

14) Change Links Calendar (Los Angeles, CA) - A request of \$1,000 to upgrade their desktop publishing computer system or for expenses of establishing an Internet venue.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

15) Arts for Peace & Justice (New Cumberland, PA) - Requesting \$1,000 toward the expenses of two art events focusing on social concerns.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

16) Glen Park Neighborhood Association (Somerville, MA) - Request of \$350 to restore a mural conceived as a means to unite and calm a racially divided area.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

Prisoners

17) Prisoners with AIDS - Rights Advocacy Group (Jonesboro, GA) - Asking for \$1,000 toward the expenses of producing their newsletter.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

18) Queer Women & Men United in Support of Political Prisoners (New York, NY) - \$618 requested for postcards and postage for a mailing in support of Mumia Abu Jamal.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

19) Prisoners Literature Project (San Francisco, CA) - Asking for \$1,000 for the purchase of books; for printing, mailing and translations.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

20) Gary Graham Legal Defense Committee (Houston, TX) - Asking for \$1,000 (minus \$200 emergency grant) toward the costs of printing and mailing a newsletter.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

Central and Latin America and the Caribbean

21) Organization in Solidarity with Central America (Detroit, MI) - Asking for \$800 toward the expenses of a Work-A-Thon in June.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

22) Paso del Norte Solidarity Committee (El Paso, TX) - Requesting \$1,000 for the production and mailing of a monthly newsletter.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

23) Guatemala Human Rights Commission/USA (Washington, DC) - Request of \$1,000 toward the non-travel expenses of their "Coalition Missing" project.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

Women

24) Breast Cancer Action Group (Burlington, VT) - A request of \$1,000 for office supplies and for staff salary.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

25) Delegation of Original Women of Philadelphia (PA) - Requesting \$1,000 toward the expenses of a workshop/gathering of Black women and their allies at an NGO Forum.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

Economic Justice

26) Campaign for Real Equitable Development (New York, NY) - A request of \$1,000 for the expenses of a demonstration in late May.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

27) People's Conference for Economic Democracy (Burlington, VT) - Asking for \$1,000 toward the costs of this conference in July.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

Labor

28) Latino Workers' Education Fund (East Boston, MA) - \$1,000 requested for operational expenses and office equipment, and for a membership drive meeting.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

29) Labor Committee on the Middle East (San Francisco, CA) - \$1,000 requested for printing and postage for an issue of the Middle East Bulletin. A Board member to review the publication.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

Miscellaneous

30) Chicago Committee in Solidarity with Southern Africa (IL) - Requesting \$1,000 to cover expenses of a conference in early June (postage, copying, telephone/fax, office supplies/equipment and a post-conference document.)

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

31) National Independent Political Summit (Brooklyn, NY) - Request of \$1,000 toward the non-travel expenses of this Summit in August.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

32) Water Information Network (Albuquerque, NM) - A request of \$1,000 for food and lodging costs for a June 10-11 WIN Media Skills & Strategy Workshop.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

33) Friends of Nitassian (Burlington, VT) - Requesting \$1,000 to purchase computer software, a laser printer and a fax machine.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

34) Future Leaders Network (Brooklyn, NY) - A request of \$1,000 toward the non-travel expenses of a Summer retreat for young people.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

LOAN REQUEST

35) Dollars & Sense Magazine (Somerville, MA) - Asking for a six month loan of \$1,000 to help finance a direct mail promotion for the publication.

Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

BUSINESS/POLICY ITEMS

- * Office matters.
- * Miscellaneous/other - to be announced.

The next Board meeting was scheduled for August 6, 1995.

For peace and justice,

Nancy Moniz
Nancy Moniz, Resist Staff

RESIST BOARD -- May, 1995

Frank Brodhead
7011 Cresheim Rd.
Phila, PA 19119
215-248-1348 (h)
215-575-0700 x259

Pam Chamberlain
36 Holworthy St.
Cambridge, MA 02138
617-864-2992 (h)
617-388-3300 x408 (w)
388-3476 (w-F)

Bell Chevigny
400 Riverside Dr. 6C
NY, NY 10025
212-749-2801

Noam Chomsky
15 Suzanne Rd.
Lex., MA 02173
617-862-6160(h)
253-7819(w)

Kate Cloud
42 Walnut St.
Som., MA 02143
617-623-5900(w)
776-4704(h)

Tess Ewing
104 Auburn St.
Camb., MA 02139
617-661-2064 (h)
627-3401 (w-F)
627-3549 (w)

Norm Fruchter
577 6th St.
Brooklyn, NY 11215
718-499-5592

Larry Goldsmith
Po Box 365
Hiram, OH 44234
216-569-7359 (h)
216-569-5466 (w)
617-524-0553 (h)

Ken Hale
209 Waltham St.
Lex., MA 02173
617-861-8164(h)
253-5744(w)

Frank Joyce
1155 Lakepointe St.
Grosse Pt., MI 48230
313-331-2785

Louis Kampf
14 Glenwood Ave.
Camb. MA 02139
617-492-3468(h)
253-5147(w)
WK. fax: 253-6105
441-0166 (h-F, call
first)

Hans Koning
500 Ellsworth Ave.
New Haven, CT 06511
203-789-2227

Paul Lauter
500 E. 77th St.
NY, NY 10162
212-570-0997(h)
203-297-2303(w)

Nancy Moniz
68 Bakersfield
Dorch., MA 02125
617-282-6128(h)
623-5110(w)

Dick Ohmann
203-347-9411 x2761(w)
413-625-2715(h)

Wayne O'Neil
31 Bournside St.
Dorch., MA 02124
617-288-1017(h)
253-2557(w)

Carlos Otero
1018 Amherst Ave.
LA, CA 90049
213-826-0455

Grace Paley
Thetford Hill
Thetford, Vt 05074
212-929-4905(h-NY)
802-785-2608(h-VT)

Stephanie Poggi
3 Monmouth St.
Som., MA 02143
628-4528

Merble Reagon
55 Bethune St.#C908
NY, NY 10014
212-691-3423(h)
964-8934(w)

Hank Rosemont
Rte. 1 Box 112x
Springridge, MD 20653
301-863-5409 (h)
301-862-0276 (w)

Tatiana Schreiber (5/1/95)
39 St. Joseph St.#6
J.P., MA 02130
617-522-7720 (h)

Renae Scott
116 Chestnut St.
Cambridge, MA 02139
617-492-1085 (h)
536-8782 (w)

Cheryl Smith
179 High St. #3
Brookline, MA 02146
617-734-3919 (h)
726-7246 (w)
695-4775 (w-F)

Meredith Smith
9 Summit St.
Somerville, MA 02144
617-628-4659

Amy Swerdlow
PoB 4142
Easthampton, NY 11937
212-666-7227
516-329-5490

George Vickers
1921 "S" St. NW
Wash. DC 20009
or: c/o WOLA
400 "C" St. NE
Washington, DC 20002
202-328-6226(h)
202-544-8045(w)
202-328-6235 (F)

Nancy Wechsler
155 Raymond St.
Camb., MA 02140
617-868-6134(h)(F)
623-5110(w)

Fran White
711 West St.
Amherst, MA 01002
413-256-8982 (h)
413-549-4600 (w)

Kate Gyllensvard
617-661-9859 h
258-6679 (MIT)

A call to **RESIST** illegitimate authority

One Summer Street, Somerville, Massachusetts 02143
617/623-5110

1

Frank Brodhead
Pam Chamberlain
Connie Chan
Bell Chevigny
Noam Chomsky
Kate Cloud
Tess Ewing
Norm Fruchter
Larry Goldsmith
Mitchell Goodman
Kenneth Hale
Oscar Hernandez
Frank Joyce
Louis Kampf
Hans Koning
Paul Lauter
Nancy Moniz
Richard Ohmann
Wayne O'Neil
Carlos Otero
Grace Paley
Roxanna Pastor
Merble Reagon
Henry Rosemont
Tatiana Schreiber
Renae Scott
Cheryl Smith
Meredith Smith
Amy Swerdlow
Ken Tangvik
Rene Valle
George Vickers
Nancy Wechsler
White

TO: The Board of Resist

From: Those Board Members attending the June 18, 1995 meeting in Boston (Louis Kampf, Wayne O'Neil, Renae Scott, Pam Chamberlain, Larry Goldsmith, Nancy Wechsler, and Cheryl Smith)

RE: Update on the current staffing and restructuring situation at Resist

Date: June 19, 1995

We are writing to inform you about staffing and restructuring issues at Resist. The minutes of the emergency Board meeting on May 18, which was called to deal with issues of staffing after Nancy Wechsler resigned, have already been distributed. At that meeting, the Board met to discuss staffing issues, and to consider the recommendation of the Personnel Committee that the office be restructured. This recommendation was accepted, over the objections of Larry Goldsmith. The decision to restructure was announced to the staff the following day. Many of you have received mailings over the past several weeks from Stephanie Poggi, Kate Gyllensvard, and Nancy Moniz, who objected to the restructuring on procedural grounds, and to the decision to offer Nancy Moniz severance pay, since the restructuring would, in all likelihood, result in the layoff of Nancy Moniz. Members of the Personnel Committee met with Stephanie, Kate, and Nancy to discuss their concerns, and in response to their request, conducted an evaluation of Nancy Moniz (see the memo from the Personnel Committee, dated June 17, 1995). An evaluation session was conducted with Nancy Moniz on Friday, June 15, 1995, with Pam Chamberlain and Cheryl Smith conducting the evaluation.

At the June 18 Board meeting, Nancy Moniz announced that, in view of the evaluation which she had received, that she had decided to quit. Stephanie Poggi and Kate Gyllensvard asked whether the Board intended to continue with the restructuring, as was recommended by the Personnel Committee. There was discussion of Stephanie and Kate's position that the restructuring was really a disguised firing of Nancy Moniz and that the personnel policies should be more strictly followed. Larry Goldsmith spoke in agreement with their position. After ascertaining that the Board intended to continue with the restructuring process, Kate and Stephanie also quit. This leaves the office staffed with only Nancy Wechsler. (Although she resigned in April, she had agreed to continue in the office until a replacement could be hired and trained.) The Board decided to attempt to fill the vacant positions on a temporary basis until the two permanent positions envisioned under the restructuring were filled. These temporary positions will be paid at an hourly wage, with no benefits, and will clearly be transitional positions until the two permanent jobs can be advertised and filled in accordance with affirmative action guidelines.

A Hiring Committee was constituted, to be composed of Louis Kampf, Renae Scott, and Nancy Wechsler. After consideration, Nancy Wechsler decided not to serve and we will add an outside person. The positions will be advertised in *Sojourner*, *Gay Community News*,

community newspapers in Dorchester, Cambridge/Somerville, etc. and possibly *The Nation*. Flyers advertising the positions will also be sent to New England area grantees. The Hiring Committee will review the resumes and interview candidates, and recommend two candidates to the Board at either the August 6 Board meeting or such other Board meeting as may be necessary given the time necessary to conduct a proper search.

The Board will revise and update the Personnel Policy, attempting to create a set of policies which can be adhered to in the future.

It was unanimously decided that the Board would honor the previous offer and conditions of severance pay and benefits to Nancy Moniz, even though she resigned. No severance pay will be offered to either Stephanie Poggi or Kate Gyllensvard (by a vote of 6 against severance pay, one abstention).

Board Outreach. Board members at the meeting agreed that the size of the active Board has shrunk to too small a number, and we will need to begin outreach to attract new Board members.

We recognize that it may have been mystifying to hear, at a distance, about what has been an extremely protracted and very painful process for all staff and Board members concerned. We thank those of you who have already been in contact with us for sharing your concerns. We encourage you, if you have further questions, to call us.

To: The board of Resist

From: The Personnel Committee

Date: June 17, 1995

In response to the request from Nancy Moniz, Stephanie Poggi, and Kate Gyllensvard, the Personnel Committee began an evaluation process of Nancy Moniz. We requested a self-evaluation from Nancy Moniz on May 29, 1995, and requested that the evaluation forms be returned to the Personnel Committee by June 5, 1995. Stephanie Poggi and Kate Gyllensvard were also invited by Louis Kampf to write evaluations of Nancy Moniz if they wished. The Personnel Committee met on June 5, 1995 to write the Personnel Committee evaluation of Nancy Moniz. As of June 5, 1995, the Personnel Committee had only received Nancy Wechsler's evaluation, since Nancy Moniz, Kate Gyllensvard, and Stephanie Poggi initially refused to participate. Between June 5 and June 16, the Personnel Committee and other Board members received copies of Kate Gyllensvard's, Stephanie Poggi's, and Nancy Moniz's evaluations. The Personnel Committee also received other letters of support for Nancy Moniz's work from grantees and the accountant. Cheryl Smith and Pam Chamberlain met to respond to and to synthesize this material and discussed the written evaluations in an evaluation session with Nancy Moniz on June 16, 1995.

The Personnel Committee decided on June 5, on the basis of its written evaluation of Nancy Moniz, not to recommend dismissal of Nancy Moniz. The Personnel Committee recognized many strengths in the technical performance of her job and the dedication and commitment to Resist that Nancy Moniz has embodied, but also noted with concern deficiencies in the areas of interpersonal relations, flexibility, and writing skills.

We further recommend that the Board continue with its decision to restructure the organization, and that Nancy may apply for one of the restructured positions. Pam Chamberlain and Cheryl Smith discussed with Nancy the need to improve her interpersonal skills in order to be seen as a strong candidate for one of the restructured positions.

Resist Board Meeting June 18, 1995
Louis Kampf's house, Cambridge

Present: Pam, Cheryl, Renae, Wayne, Louis, Wechsler (minutes), Larry, (Nancy M., Stephanie Poggi, Kate Kyllensvard stayed for part of the meeting).

Emergency Grants: At the meeting we decided to award emergency grants to the following three groups: The Dyke March Committee (Boston, MA) \$200 we hope you will become an ongoing organization-- and do it again next year. (Wechsler talked to Susan Trotz after the meeting, and their goal is to be ongoing); the Committee for a Just Supreme Judicial Court (Boston, MA) \$200; "Queers vs. the Supremes" forum (Boston, MA). After the board meeting we gave out a \$200 emergency grant to the Rosenberg Fund for Children (Springfield, MA). Robby Meeropol is going to write a letter about the upcoming execution of Mumia Abu Jamal, and mail it to the RFC list to raise funds and educate people about what is going on.

Total emergency grants: \$800.

Grants: We gave out a total of \$19,500 to 24 groups, plus one loan to Dollars and Sense.

1. Overcoming Poverty Together (Mankato, MN) NO GRANT. They had requested \$1000 toward the purchase of a computer and to hire an organizer. Negative reference, lots of foundation support, lack of connection to grassroots people they are supporting, lack of clear budget. Unreasonable budget to have person do ten tasks.
2. Religion and Diversity Project (Burnsville, NC) YES To a grant of \$1000 to purchase a fax machine, a photo copy machine and a computer. What are their other plans for fundraising, what other sources of funding do they have? Almost entirely Quaker? But SALGA (Gay/Lesbian group in area) seemed to reflect otherwise. Good project. YES.
3. Centro Salvadoreno (Hempstead, NY) YES TO \$500. They had requested \$1000 for a TV and VCR for their education and outreach project. Questions: are they a political organization. Have they already done this? Deadline is coming up for immigration. What are their politics? What will they be doing? \$500
4. Institute for the Study of the Religious Right (LA, CA) YES TO A GRANT OF \$1000 to pay staff time used in educational presentations to activist groups in California. Does this overlap with what other groups are doing? Maybe there is enough work for everyone.

Discussion of grants is stopped at this point to discuss personnel issues. See below, and attached copy.

5. Empty the Shelters (SF, CA) YES to a grant of \$1000 toward their leadership development training project for youth.
6. The Plan Committee (JP, MA) NO GRANT. They had requested \$1000 toward the expenses of the First Latino Community Leadership Conference. They got \$50,000 from Boston Foundation. Seems very electoral. Getting people on the school committee, etc. NO. not a Resist priority. More mainstream than we fund, but good luck with your work.
7. Border Rights Coalition (El Paso, TX) yes to a grant of \$1000 to purchase a photo machine.
8. Citizen Soldier (NY, NY) YES to a grant of \$1000 for the expenses of producing a special issue of the newspaper On Guard. Wayne gave report on newspaper. Yes, but maybe in the future we could fund

fundraising or dissemination project-- something to help you raise funds, or get your newspaper out to community based groups that might have influence in the schools.

9. Veterans for Peace (Minn. MN) YES to a grant for \$1000 for a laser printer. This group seems good. We support your efforts to become more diverse.

10. Human Rights Project (Kansas City, MO) YES to a grant for \$850, as requested, for the expenses and mailing costs of a membership recruitment brochure for the gay/lesbian community. Liberal, electoral, narrow focus. Not political. But this kind of work needs to be done. Doing concrete organizing. This is Kansas City, after all. YES Please, we would like you to make an effort to increase your board diversity.

11. Rural Concerns Consortium (Danville, NH) NO GRANT. They had requested \$1000 to create a central office to facilitate communication between rural gay and lesbian organizations and activists. How will this office function? Is this a one person project? Is it really national? Is it only a computer and telephone campaign. Trying to support a network of rural organizers at the NGTLF conference. Involve rural activists in the planning of the conference. NO If something serious about creating a national network comes out of conference, please come back to us.

12. Children of Lesbians & Gays Everywhere (SF, CA) No. They had requested a grant of \$1000 to purchase a photo copying machine. Not a resist priority. Filling a need. Glad you're doing the work.

13. Arkansas Broadcasting Foundation (Little Rock) YES to a grant of \$800, as requested, to purchase field recording equipment to train members of groups fighting for social and economic change. Big budget for the radio station. Imbedded in community. YES.

14. Change Links Calendar (LA, CA) NO GRANT. They had requested \$1000 to upgrade their desktop publishing computer system or for expenses of establishing an Internet venue. Like the idea of calendar. Low priority. Do people see this as organizing? Can enable organizing. Nice letter. NO.

15. Arts for Peace and Justice (New Cumberland, PA) NO GRANT. They had requested \$1000 toward the expenses of two art events focussing on social concerns. Not really a group, not organizing, kind of a social event. Just a once a year event.

16. Glen Park Neighborhood Association (Somerville, MA) YES to a grant of \$350, as requested, to restore a mural conceived as a means to unite and calm a racially divided area.

17. PWA-RAG (Jonesboro, GA) YES to a grant of \$1000 toward the expenses of producing their newsletter. Is this political organizing or social service? Because of the people it is addressing, yes.

18. Queer Women and Men United in Support of Political Prisoners (NY, NY) NO GRANT. They had requested \$618 for postcards and postage for a mailing in support of Mumia Abu Jamal. Who are these people? NO. There are plenty of people doing this work. This group is making connection between gays and prisoners, but we don't see that it is being made effectively. Budget? Not enough information. Lack of analysis, tone, etc.

19. Prisoners Literature Project (SF, CA) YES to \$500 out of \$1000 requested for the purchase of books; for printing, mailing and translations. Why don't we fund them to fundraise? How can you have an ongoing project that is self-sustaining. We need to see some clear fundraising efforts in order for you to come back to us. Spanish books, Our Bodies Our Selves, South End Press donations, outreach to women's prisons.

20. Gary Graham Legal Defense Committee (Houston, TX) YES (\$800) Toward the costs of printing and mailing a newsletter. They had previously been awarded a \$200 emergency grant.
21. Organization in Solidarity with Central America (Detroit, MI) yes to a grant of \$800, as requested, toward the expenses of a Work-a-Thon in June. Encourage them to do fundraising. The follow up report was in the new references.
22. Paso del Norte Solidarity Committee (El Paso, TX) yes to a grant of \$1000 for the production and mailing of a monthly newsletter.
23. Guatemala Human Rights Commission/USA (Wash., DC) YES to a grant of \$1000 toward the non-travel expenses of their "Coalition Missing" project. \$140,000 budget. You are getting toward the maximum level of funding we fund. YES. Very positive letter.
24. Breast Cancer Action Group (Burlington, VT) NO GRANT. They had requested \$1000 for office supplies and for staff salary. They have some money saved up, what are they saving it for? Do we want to fund this particular project? We would rather fund them to challenge the American Cancer Society, or push the environmental connection to cancer, etc. NO.
25. Delegation of Original Women of Philadelphia (PA) NO Grant. They had requested \$1000 toward the expenses of a workshop/gathering of Black women and their allies at an NGO Forum. Is this what we fund? We would be interested in having you organize in your community about what went on at the conference.
26. Campaign for Real Equitable Development (NY, NY) YES to a grant of \$1000 for the expenses of a demonstration in late May. Nothing on reproductive rights. Demo came off. Representative group of speakers. YES.
27. People's Conference for Economic Democracy (Burlington, VT) SOME. \$300. They had requested \$1000 toward the costs of this conference in July. Good references. One shot thing. Expensive to pull off. Is this the best use of money right now? Purpose of conference vague. Some speakers liberal. Some radical. Why don't they just have a demonstration? Press/publicity campaign. Too many speakers. Token? Some? Agree to SOME.
28. Latino Workers' Education Fund (East Boston, MA) SOME. \$300. They had requested \$1000 for operational expenses and office equipment, and for a membership drive meeting. No reference. We haven't been able to get a reference for you. SOME. Please send us some more info on your group, and references we could contact.
29. Labor Comm. on the Middle East (SF, CA) NO GRANT. They had requested \$1000 for printing and postage for an issue of the Middle East Labor Bulletin. Newsletter has some useful information. Rhetoric of newsletter gets in the way. What the editor is writing is not quite as useful as a year ago, as some mainstream publications are starting to cover some of this. Isn't strong on organizing around labor. Louis can't see funding them again. //Some articles still very good, but we don't see how it is used in a concrete way in organizing. Rhetoric gets in the way. People who disagree with you are not necessarily evil.
30. Chicago Comm. in Solidarity with Southern Africa (IL) YES to a grant of \$1000 to cover expenses of a conference in early June (postage, copying, telephone/fax, office supplies/equipment, and a post-conference document.) No update on event. we've funded them before, they are a good group. We would like post conference document/evaluation. YES.

31. National Independent Political Summit (Brooklyn, NY) YES to a grant of \$1000 toward the non-travel expenses of this summit in August. Wechsler tried to explain the difference between this meeting and another taking place at another time. Thought this was the more radical and grassroots.

32. Water Information Network (Alb., NM) SOME \$300. They had requested \$1000 for food and lodging costs for a June 10-11 WIN Media Skills and Strategy Workshop. They have a lot of money. What is make up of trainers? Predominantly Native Americans. They get very straight money. How they talk about stuff-- didn't sit right. Event just happened. Reference is "highly recommended". Water is a big issue in Indian country. This is very important, it deserves big bucks. You are out of our range in planning this. We'll give you this small amount of money to show our support, but we don't think you should marginalize yourselves. The event happened, what do you still need? \$SOME, and we would like to hear more about what happened, and to know more about your overall comprehensive plan for integrating media strategizing with your other community work.

33. Friends of Nitassinan (Burl., VT) YES to \$1000 grant to purchase computer software, a laser printer and a fax machine.

34. Future Leaders Network (Brooklyn, NY) YES to a grant of \$1000 toward the non-travel expenses of a Summer retreat for young people.

35. LOAN: D&S. YES to a six month loan to help finance a direct mail promotion for the publication.

Finances: as of June 16, 1995

Cambridge Trust Co.	\$ 20,316.61
Bond Fund	\$ 36,501.99
Managed Growth Port.	\$107,483.15
Operating Fund	\$ 58,959.55
sub-total unrestricted: \$223,261.30	

Loan Fund	\$ 6,366.16
Resist Endowment Fund*	\$ 35,437.77
Cohen Endowment Fund*	\$ 11,144.09
sub-total restricted funds: \$52,948.02	
Total all funds: \$276,209.32	

*Principle in Resist endowment is \$32,100

**Principle in Cohen endowment is \$10,000

We have enough money to give out a Cohen and Salzman grant.

Other Business:

See Attached Letters.

Check signers and wire transferers: Louis, Pam, Wechsler

We need some extra help in the office. Process work from this meeting, process stuff that comes in.

Question raised about brochure? How far along is the brochure and newsletter for July August.

July/August-- newsletter. Pam will talk to Stephanie about all this.
We could wait till September to do newsletter. (Skip the July/August issue.)

We will hire people for temporary positions for up to 56 hours/week. No benefits. Temporary.

Severance pay: Stick with NM's agreement-- pay till Oct. 6 and insurance. Then she can apply for unemployment. We will not challenge it if she applies for unemployment.

Hiring committee: Louis Kampf, (away July 13-29)
Renae Scott
Nancy Wechsler*

HC POWER: Interview and make recommendations to board: Recommendations can include a slightly different configuration than the current job descriptions. We would like a both people to be hired at the same time. Aiming for a mid summer board meeting that would take up recommendations.

Mailing of job flyer to grantees in CT, RI, NH, VT., ME, MA, and all board members, and some individuals.

What's the salary range: \$25,000-\$30,000. Full health benefits. Vacation: three weeks; six month probation with evaluation. Evaluation will be done by end of sixth months.

Do we need bd/staff lunch? HC meeting? If we do, Wechsler will call. She'll stay in touch with Louis and Cheryl.

ADS: Put ad in Banner. Cambridge Chronicle, Somerville Chronicle, Nation? yes if under \$100.
Dorchester Comm News? Som. Comm. News?

Personnel comm. will review personnel policy.

Board recruitment needs to get talked about. No grants at mid-august meeting. September meeting will be grants.

BOARD MEETING: August 6th tentative date. Cheryl's house. Maybe in evening.

(*After the meeting Wechsler reconsidered her volunteering for the hiring committee and withdrew her name. She and Tess proposed that we get an outside person to join Louis and Renae. Louis and Cheryl agreed to this proposal. Tess suggested Cheryl Gooding, and Wechsler proposed Gordon Gottlieb. Louis was going to follow up. Wechsler will still be a consultant to the hiring committee.)

ADS already placed as of time of board meeting: Gay Community News, Dollars and Sense, Sojourner, Peacework; and a flyer was printed. ADS placed after the board meeting: Cambridge Chronicle (includes papers in Somerville, Watertown and Medford), Bay State Banner, Nation. Job flyer mailed out day after board meeting.

enclosures: Letter to the board of Resist from the Personnel Committee dated June 17, 1995; and Letter to the Board of Resist from those board members attending the June 18th board meeting, updating the rest of the board on the current staffing and restructuring situation at Resist.

To: Board Members

From: Cheryl Smith

Date: May 29, 1995

Re: Background to the restructuring decision and to the motivation for the office restructuring.

The Personnel Committee recommended to the Board, and the Board accepted the recommendation, that the office be restructured. First, I would like to acknowledge that, as his letter states, Larry Goldsmith opposed the recommendation of the Personnel Committee. Pam Chamberlain did in fact represent his opposition at the Board meeting, and his position was discussed; the remainder of the Board voted in favor of the restructuring. I apologize that his opposition was not separately noted.

The decision to restructure the office was not taken lightly, but in response to a long process of evaluation and persistent attempts to address issues in the office. In view of Larry's letter, and the letter from the staff, I would like to respond by providing my perspective on the events. I have shared this with Louis, but I bear full responsibility for this document. First, to lay out the chronology of events, from the Personnel Committee's point of view. I have constructed this chronology by gathering together and reviewing my notes from the Personnel Committee (an approximately two inch thick stack of material).

The Personnel Committee has included members of the staff, when the issues being discussed did not directly pertain to the performance and evaluation of individual staff members. Throughout the spring and summer of 1993, the Personnel committee met to discuss the issues of pay, benefits, sabbaticals, and job configurations. We considered instituting a 403(b) or other retirement plan, such as a SEP IRA, granting sabbaticals, and whether a cafeteria-style benefits plan was feasible. Participating in these discussions were: Tess, Pam, Cheryl, Louis, Wayne, Nancy M., Nancy W., and Yana. The discussions were initiated after a request by Yana that we consider instituting a sabbatical leave policy.

The PC decided that a sabbatical leave policy was not practicable for an organization with a staff the size of Resist's, and began to explore in greater depth the issue of why a sabbatical leave was requested. In the course of these interviews, we reviewed the job descriptions of each of the staff persons, and heard numerous discussions (when meeting with individual staff members) of tension in the office, of the difficulty of having three people work in the office together, of how small the office was, of how difficult it was to apportion out the work. The job descriptions produced by the staff are extremely detailed about just exactly what each staff member will or won't do, and under what circumstances they will do it.

As part of the process, and in conjunction with Yana's requests to change some of the configuration of her job, and since Yana appeared to be the one under most stress, we interviewed Yana about her job. Some of the stress at that time appeared to be about the staffing for and the planning of the 25th anniversary. Yana additionally proposed that we should hire someone to look into moving and coordinating the office. She believed that there was too much work to be done, without sufficient time, and that assistance that she needed from Kate Gyllensvard received

12
a low priority. The Board wrote a letter to Yana, dated October 8, 1993, reviewing her job description and definitively stating that the sabbatical leave policy was not feasible, and that we would not be hiring additional help at that time. Cheryl and Pam met with Yana to discuss the letter. In the discussion, my (Cheryl's) notes indicate: "staff members need to take responsibility for their own relationships/communications; look to the Board for help if they need it." Yana, in reaction to the letter, felt that the statements in the letter were unrealistic, and that more staffing was needed. Pam and I noted that the committee wanted to look at the work, and look at the problems, and work with the staff, rather than trying to impose or implement a solution.

On December 5, 1993, the Personnel Committee reported to the Board on personnel issues. (see memo dated 12/5/93). Finding #1 notes that the work of the office is being done, and is being done well. Finding #3 refers to ongoing difficulties in the office due to interpersonal relations, and notes that some of these may result from the objective working conditions at Resist, such as the size of the office, etc. The memo recommends that the staff take responsibility for resolving interpersonal issues; that ongoing staff-board lunches be used as a forum for dealing with general interpersonal issues, and that "the board, on request will offer to help resolve interpersonal tensions through support, mediation, or referral to trusted mediators."

After this time, the staff, unable to resolve the differences between them, asked for Board help in mediation (repeating an earlier process which had involved Pam and Roxanna Pastor). Pam and Tess met with the staff, and with mediators from Cambridge to discuss the office issues over an extended period of time, going into May. This involved a substantial commitment of time on the part of the involved Board members. On May 25, Nancy Moniz requested and was granted a three month leave of absence, because she was too stressed out. The leave was granted at a Board/Staff lunch, and then ratified at the next board meeting; Board hired Nancy Palmer as interim grants coordinator. During part of her leave, Nancy Moniz did not attend mediation; but at the request of Tess, she did meet with the two mediators and Tess during her leave in order to catch up to where the process was; then there was a mediation session with all three of the staff. Nancy Wechsler was also showing signs of severe stress, with her Crohn's disease flaring up, and on 6/5/94 the Board approved her request that she be allowed to go back working three days a week rather than four to help manage her disease and to reduce her stress. The Board agreed to hire Kate Gyllensvard to work the 8 hours per week NW would not be working.

In September, 1994, Yana asked for a six month leave of absence. The Personnel Committee asked that she attend the mediation sessions during her leave as the mediation process had been extremely frustrating, and it seemed impossible to get all three staff members together to attend it. In the letter to Yana, we wrote, we "believe that it is necessary for the staff to work together, rather than each performing her task individually. We believe that your absence from the office for such a protracted period of time will be a hindrance to the effort which we have begun through mediation to pull the staff together." An initial letter was written to Yana, and a counterproposal. Ultimately, Yana decided to resign, citing in her resignation letter, among other factors, the personnel issues: "Faced with the prospect of continued mediation during the time of my leave, I find myself unable to participate further. I do feel strongly that this process was a worthwhile one to pursue."

Stephanie Poggi was hired on an interim basis to produce the newsletter.

After Yana's resignation, the non-staff members of the Personnel committee met to discuss the newsletter position, and whether to immediately take steps to fill the position. We decided that we would continue with an interim position for the next six months. Our thinking on this was that we wanted to see if the tensions in the office would resolve with a change in the participants, or, if there was something structural in the way that the jobs were arranged which made the tension inevitable, or if Nancy Moniz and Nancy Wechsler could not get along. If the staff members could not get along, then the jobs would have to be restructured, including the possibility that one or more staff persons would need to leave. Tess Ewing conveyed this information to the staff members. Nancy Wechsler wrote a letter to Tess on December 21 and to the Board and Personnel Committee on December 27 in reference to that conversation; what Tess had conveyed was clear. (Also clear, is that we should have put it in writing at that time -- it was my, Cheryl's job, and I didn't do it before my back went out on December 26; I then spent most of the next three weeks in bed. After I went back to work, I then didn't get to it). Tess also asked the staff at that time for input into hours and possible structure for a permanent newsletter position. Nancy Wechsler and Stephanie Poggi responded in writing to that request.

Nancy Moniz and Nancy Wechsler wrote a letter on January 4, asking to proceed on a new round of interpersonal mediation with Renae Scot^t, as a followup to the staff's request for a ombudsperson for interpersonal issues and a business ombudsperson, with whom the staff could talk about business issues. These mediation sessions appeared to stir up great distress; On April 21, Nancy Wechsler turned in a letter of resignation.

After Wechsler's letter of resignation, Louis, Cheryl, Pam, Tess, and Renae met to discuss the situation. It was decided that the six month period in which we would see whether the removal of Yana from the office would improve the situation had yielded a clear answer of no. We decided to interview Wechsler, Moniz, and Stephanie Poggi to determine what conditions were in the office, and to see what suggestions each of them might have for improving the office situation. In our view, staff members were clear that they did not want a director for the office, but wanted to continue a cooperative work environment. After interviewing each of the three, Pam, Louis, Wayne, Renae, and Cheryl met to discuss the interviews and to decide how to proceed from there. The Personnel Committee recommended that in order for an office to function collectively, i.e., without a director, and with each employee taking individual responsibility for the functioning of the whole, that certain staff qualifications were necessary. These were enumerated in the minutes from the meeting. It was also felt that in some way the structure of the jobs contributed to the difficulties in the office. Additionally, we have repeatedly needed to resort to part time additional help to ease the work load in situations of medical leave, etc., and that it was difficult to maintain continuity for donors and grantees under these conditions. Therefore, the PC recommended that the office needed to be restructured in view of the long standing and continuous conflict between members of the staff extending over many years, and in view of certain structural characteristics of the jobs and the space constraints which may contribute to that conflict. By restructuring the office into two jobs, we hoped to place more focus on the staff as a collective, which was the clearly expressed desire of the staff, and to give the two staff members full time, equal status, and full responsibility for the office management. See minutes of Resist Personnel Committee

Meeting, May 12, 1995. Personnel committee recommended restructuring to an emergency meeting of the Board, held May 18, 1995. Between the time of the Personnel Committee meeting and the Board meeting, the Personnel Committee consulted the lawyer for the Board, who agreed that the Board did in fact have the power to restructure the office, and that restructuring seemed appropriate in this situation. The recommendation to restructure was discussed, and adopted with some modification at the Board meeting, with Larry Goldsmith expressing his strong opposition by proxy through Pam Chamberlain. See May 18 minutes and letter from Pam and Louis to the Resist Staff dated May 19, 1995.

After the results of the Board meeting were conveyed to Nancy Moniz, Louis and Pam attempted to contact Kate and Stephanie, and were unable to reach them in person (they left messages on their answering machines). In the meantime, Kate, Stephanie, and Nancy Moniz decided to walk off the job. Rather than sending the newsletter, which was due at the printer on May 19, and which was to accompany a fundraising flyer, they turned off the answering machine and walked out for the next week, without calling, talking, or negotiating. They mailed a letter with three demands to be met. See their letter dated May 19, 1995.

In their letter, they argue that Resist's personnel policy has not been followed with regard to the restructuring and its effect on the current staff. Stephanie Poggi, Kate Gyllensvard, and Nancy Moniz refer to themselves as "the current workers at Resist (Nancy Wechsler having resigned)." It is worth emphasizing that under the Personnel policy, neither Stephanie nor Kate qualify as "staff." Stephanie Poggi was hired on a temporary basis to edit the newsletter, and was asked in December if she would be willing to continue on a temporary basis during the six month period while we saw whether the tensions in the office would dissipate with a change in the people in the office. It was very clear that Stephanie's position would extend until a decision was made concerning hiring for the newsletter, at which time it was understood that she could apply for the job if she wished. She is still free to apply for one of the restructured positions. Kate Gyllensvard is a consultant, under Resist's personnel policy, and has been hired on an interim basis to fill in for hours for Nancy Wechsler variously, first for Nancy's parental leave, and later for when Nancy's health and parental status prevented her from working full time. Upon Nancy Wechsler's resignation, even without a restructuring, the decision to continue using the consultant services of Kate would be in question if the Board were to hire a full time person for Nancy Wechsler's position. There is a problem of continuity in structuring a new hire to be part time, and to have an additional part time person do a part of the job. Kate is also free to apply for one of the restructured positions. Nancy Wechsler, who has resigned but has offered to continue working on an interim basis until her replacement is hired is still an employee, but they do not object to the effect of the restructuring on her, and left her out of their reference to themselves as "the current workers of Resist." With respect to Nancy Moniz, the personnel policy clearly gives authority to the Board to restructure the office. We believe there is ample reason to believe that restructuring the office is both appropriate and necessary to the health of the organization. The severance package offered to Nancy Moniz was clearly more generous than would be offered to an employee who was fired, with 20 weeks of paid severance time.

I hope that this chronology helps to provide some context for the discussion.

To: All Board Members, Stephanie Poggi, Kate Gyllensvard, Nancy Moniz, and Nancy Wechsler

From: Cheryl Smith and Louis Kampf

Re: Notes from meeting between Louis Kampf and Cheryl Smith with Stephanie Poggi, Kate Gyllensvard, and Nancy Moniz -- May 25, 1995, at 40 Court Street, Boston.

Stephanie Poggi, Nancy Moniz, and Kate Gyllensvard had requested a meeting with the Personnel Committee to protest the decision to restructure the Resist office, and in particular, what they believe is only an attempt to fire Nancy Moniz. They expressed their concern that, in the event of a firing of Nancy Moniz, that the personnel policies should be followed.

Background to the meeting: prior to the meeting, on May 19, SP, NM, and KG issued a memo to the Board of Resist expressing their opposition to the restructuring, and beginning an immediate work stoppage until three demands of theirs were met. (See memo dated May 19, 1995). The newsletter, which was supposed to go to the printer on Friday, May 19, was not taken to the printer, the answering machine was turned off, and KG, SP, and NM did not show up for work the following week. Louis and Cheryl directed Nancy Wechsler, who did show up for work, to secure the files with the lists of the major donors and other vital materials. Louis, Renae, and Cheryl agreed to meet with SP, KG, and NM, and suggested a time; however, Renae was not able to make the time which was eventually agreed upon.

Louis and Cheryl opened the meeting by stating that they were at the meeting in order to listen, but that they had not been empowered by either the board or the P.C. to make or change any policy decisions.

SP, KG, and NM first asked how the Personnel Committee came to the decision that it had come to. Cheryl reviewed with them the background to the process (attached) that she had constructed from her notes over time. SP and KG noted that personnel policies of regular evaluation had not been followed. CS responded that there had been a long process of continual feedback and informal evaluation; that the issues of staff flexibility and ability to get along in the office had been raised on numerous occasions. SP responded that this was not the same as officially evaluating the staff, and officially pinpointing which staff member was responsible for the problem, and giving adequate notice to that staff member. Louis noted that the staff has been saying for approximately two years that it would get started on evaluations, but that it has not yet happened.

KG, SP, and NM stated that they would like to see:

- 1) a discussion of the personnel policy to make it workable for Resist for the future.
- 2) a discussion of the process for restructuring and filling staff positions, and that they would like to have input into this.

3) they would like to discuss with (the PC? the Board?) the effects of the restructuring on their positions and the implications of termination that it had.

4) Nancy Moniz should be evaluated; KG in particular would like to have the opportunity to evaluate NM.

5) SP, KG, and NM want to talk about the effect of restructuring on Nancy Moniz.

Louis and Cheryl asked whether they intended to return to work the next week; they indicated that they needed to discuss that together. Louis and Cheryl indicated that, in any event, Nancy Wechsler would still be working in the office. After meeting together, KG advised Louis that the staff would return to work and that the newsletter would go out. NM will work on W, Th, F, and Saturday during the next week. They agreed that NW will participate in the process of peer evaluation and restructuring.

Recommendations of Louis and Cheryl:

1. We agree to the request for the evaluation of Nancy Moniz, and **recommend that such evaluation happen immediately.**

Procedure: Cheryl will draw up evaluation forms, adapting the Haymarket evaluation forms and other sources as necessary for use in the Resist office. Nancy Moniz will be asked to evaluate herself; Nancy Wechsler, as a peer staff member, should also be asked to evaluate her. Pam Chamberlain and Tess Ewing, as Board members who have had close contact with the staff in the processes of mediation, should be asked to evaluate her as well. Recommended timetable: Evaluation forms to be completed and returned to the Personnel Committee by 11:00 A.M. Monday, June 5; we recommend that the non-staff members of the Personnel Committee will then meet that week to discuss the evaluations, in accordance with Section 2 of the Personnel Policy, which indicates that the PC will conduct staff evaluation.

Who on the PC should do the evaluation? Section 4.2, Procedure for Yearly Evaluation, indicates that staff evaluation will be conducted once a year by the PC, without indicating whether this is the full PC or the non-staff board members of the PC. Section 4.2.4 indicates "the PC should meet with each staff member individually to discuss the evaluation; and then meet with the staff as a whole to do group evaluation" Further, Section 4.2.5 indicates "the PC may, at their own discretion or at the request of the staff, prepare written evaluations of both individual staff members, (which are sent to each confidentially) and /or of the entire staff." We (Louis and Cheryl) find it difficult to interpret how staff members (of which there are only 2 regular employees at this time) can be on the committee, and yet prepare a confidential written evaluation, which would be shared with one of those two staff members. Addition to the Resist Personnel Policy, when the policy was adopted 6/2/88, and found in the "Resist Board Policy Decisions" file, notes that "the board decided to constitute a Personnel Committee consisting of board and staff members with the staff involved in all stages of PC Committee work except when

(7)

staff is under discussion." Louis and Cheryl's recommendation: **the non-staff board members of the PC should meet with Nancy Moniz to discuss the evaluations collected in the process. Then, non-staff board members of the PC will prepare a written evaluation of Nancy Moniz, which they will share with her, in accordance with section 4.2.5. The results of the evaluation will also be reported to the Board at the June 18th meeting, along with any recommendations from the PC committee.**

2. Staff input into the restructuring. We recommend that the Board be open to specific staff input into the shape of the restructuring, i.e., which tasks are most appropriately done together, and which tasks are most likely to be difficult for any one person to do in combination. All current employees (and our consultant, Kate Gyllensvard) would be eligible to provide input; particularly in the form of written recommendations, but also through discussions. Staff have been encouraged to provide input and in fact have share information and input on their jobs in the past, including three full length interviews which the Personnel Committee had with NW, NM, and SP. The PC has taken this feedback into account, and specifically did not recommend a structure with a director because of the staff's concern that Resist remain a collective. However, **we do recommend that the timetable for the restructuring not be changed; the history of several years of staff conflict while the jobs were in the present configuration is adequate evidence of the need for change.**

3. Some advertising for the positions is already out at the printers in various periodicals; these ads should not be withdrawn. Advertising for the position(s) for the fall should be done insofar as possible in accordance with the current personnel policy; however, we recommend that the Board address the issue of the constitution of the Hiring committee at the next Board meeting; the provision requiring the participation of two staff members will be difficult to fulfill under current conditions. Additionally, advertising for the position(s) in the future should stress the need for flexibility around exact job descriptions since we recommend reviewing the positions with staff input.

4. We recommend that the personnel policy be revisited; in its current form it is appropriate to a much larger organization than Resist currently is. However, it is unrealistic that this be expected to be done in the immediate future. The Personnel Committee, in conjunction with the then current staff, should take this matter up in the fall.

(8)

BOARD/PEER – EMPLOYEE EVALUATION FORM

This is a report to be completed by peer staff persons and non-staff Board evaluators prior to annual (or more frequent) reviews of an individual staff member. The answers to these questions will be used for purposes of discussion at the review, along with answers to parallel questions completed by the staff person, and by non-staff members of the Personnel Committee who have knowledge of the staff person's work. It consists of two parts: a skills evaluation, which lists a variety of skills and asks you to evaluate the staff member in each of those areas, and a more open-ended questionnaire whose purpose is to focus on the staff person's goals, his or her strengths, and how his or her actual duties match those strengths, as well as his or her success with past goals. The reviewing committee will seek feedback as to how Resist can help a staff person better meet his or her goals, and will focus on how the staff person's goals fit in with organizational objectives and structures.

Part I. Skills Evaluation Sheet

CRITERIA	COMMENTS
1. <u>Job Knowledge</u> : Clear understanding of what, when, and how the work is to be done; makes sure asks for information if they are not clear.	
2. <u>Interpersonal Skills and Cooperation</u> : Ability to work and communicate effectively with co-workers, grantees, donors; willing to share knowledge and assist others. Keeps co-workers informed of work.	
3. <u>Group Facilitation Skills</u> : Able to guide group effectively, get group members to hear each other, set and reach group goals.	
4. <u>Sense of Responsibility</u> : Dependability, follow-through: Extends self when unusual need arises; readiness to accept job assignments, tasks, and willingness to put forth required effort; finishes projects on a timely basis once started.	

<p>5. <u>Creativity and Initiative:</u> self-directed, able to start assignments, work without a lot of direction, shows creativity and innovativeness around work, tries to expand job in a reasonable manner.</p>	
<p>6. <u>Quality of work:</u> Ability to turn out work which is complete, accurate, thorough which meets standards set; produces useful results.</p>	
<p>7. <u>Organizational skills:</u> Clearly plans and sets job objectives and tasks on a weekly basis; establishes appropriate priorities for overall work activity.</p>	

Part II. Questionnaire

1. What is your understanding of this staff person's current job description?

2. What do you consider to be this staff person's greatest strengths?

3. In what areas do you feel this staff person needs improvement? Why?

4. How do you feel this staff person accepts constructive criticism? From the Board? From other staff members? Does he or she use suggestions to improve job performance?

5. How do you feel this staff person communicates and works with the Board? Why?

6. How do you feel this staff person communicates and works with other staff members? Why?

7. What were mutually agreed-upon goals for the past year? Has he or she accomplished them?

8. What do you feel should be the goals for this staff person for the next year?

9. How do you think Resist can help this staff person meet his or her goals?

Please use the remaining space or the space on the back for other comments.

EMPLOYEE SELF-EVALUATION FORM

This is a report card for you to fill in for yourself. It consists of two parts: a skills evaluation, which lists a variety of skills and asks you to evaluate yourself in each of those areas, and a more open-ended questionnaire whose purpose is to focus you and your evaluator(s) on your goals, on your success with past goals, on where you think your strengths are and how your actual duties match those strengths. Your peer and board evaluators will be filling in a comparable form, and in your review we will discuss both responses, set new goals, and ask you for feedback as to how we can help you meet those goals.

Part I. Skills Evaluation Sheet

CRITERIA	COMMENTS
1. <u>Job Knowledge</u> : Clear understanding of what, when, and how the work is to be done; makes sure asks for information if they are not clear.	
2. <u>Interpersonal Skills and Cooperation</u> : Ability to work and communicate effectively with co-workers, grantees, donors; willing to share knowledge and assist others. Keeps co-workers informed of work.	
3. <u>Group Facilitation Skills</u> : Able to guide group effectively, get group members to hear each other, set and reach group goals.	
4. <u>Sense of Responsibility</u> : Dependability, follow-through: Extends self when unusual need arises; readiness to accept job assignments, tasks, and willingness to put forth required effort; finishes projects on a timely basis once started.	

<p>5. <u>Creativity and Initiative:</u> self-directed, able to start assignments, work without a lot of direction, shows creativity and innovativeness around work, tries to expand job in a reasonable manner.</p>	
<p>6. <u>Quality of work:</u> Ability to turn out work which is complete, accurate, thorough which meets standards set; produces useful results.</p>	
<p>7. <u>Organizational skills:</u> Clearly plans and sets job objectives and tasks on a weekly basis; establishes appropriate priorities for overall work activity.</p>	

Part II. Questionnaire

1. What is your understanding of your current job description?

2. What do you think of as your greatest strengths?

3. In what areas do you feel you most need to improve? Why?

4. Do you feel you are fairly compensated? Please include benefits, and explain your answer.

5. It is important that every member of a team be able to listen to constructive suggestions from others. How do you feel you rank in your ability to listen to suggestions and, if they are valid, use them to improve yourself and your job?

How would you rate communications with the Board? Excellent, good, fair, poor, or nonexistent? Why do

you think this is so?

7. How would you rate communications with other staff members? Excellent, good, fair, poor, or nonexistent?

Why do you think this is so?

8. How often do you have staff meetings, and how might they be improved?

9. What have been your goals in working at Resist? Have you accomplished them?

10. What are your goals for the next year?

11. How can Resist help you to meet your goals?

Please use the remaining space or the space on the back for other comments.

Minutes from the Personnel Committee meeting to deal with Yana's resignation.

Present: Tess Ewing, Cheryl Smith, Louis Kampf, Pam Chamberlain, Wayne O'Neil?

Met to discuss Yana's resignation. Letter to Yana, "Dear Yana, with regret we have decided to accept your resignation. The Board appreciates the fine work, etc."

Job requirements:

What are the tasks in the office:

Newsletter

Fundraising

Contacts/grants

Office Manager tasks

Office manager and newsletter could use more hours?

Newsletter positions requires either that they know Pagemaker or that their are willing to train in computer skills, need layout skills, writing, editing, familiarity with a broad range of political work. We would want a writing sample, and sample design work.

Stephanie Poggi is currently filling in. What is her availability? Can she work more hours? Is she willing to work for an extended period of 6 to 8 months?

Decision to tell staff:

One year ago, the Board offered the staff the opportunity to work the interpersonal situation out. The Board paid for mediation, and joined the staff in mediation. There is little evidence that this is proving to be helpful. This current staff is not working well together.

Rather than hiring immediately for the newlester position, the PC recommends that we have a six month trial run, including Stephanie Poggi as newsletter editor. In six months, we will have a true job search for the newsletter position. During this time, we will see if the same pattern of conflict continues. If they do, the PC will recommend to the Board a major reconstruction which could include changing job descriptions; making jobs more flexible, changing the hours, or terminating one or more people.

The staff could come to the Board with a proposal for how these problems will be resolved. the Board would prefer that the newsletter editor work longer hours, and that there not be a fourth person added to the staff. If there is not a staff plan, the Board will have a plan.

To: Resist Staff

From: Pam Chamberlain and Louis Kampf for the Personnel Committee

In Re: Current Crisis

Date: May 19, 1995

Today we are presenting the results of an emergency Board meeting held May 18. This memo describes the background of our decisions. As you are all too aware, the Personnel Committee and the staff have been struggling with staff/office issues for a protracted amount of time. This has taken a toll on everyone's time, on staff health and productivity, and on the patience and commitment of board members. Two out of the three regular staff have resigned in the past six months. We have had to hire temporary help for all three staff over time and pay for mediation when volunteer Board mediation was unsuccessful. We do not want the situation to have an adverse effect on the grants management, fundraising and newsletter activities that are the core of the organization, and we do not want to let down our faithful donors or the political work we support.

Since it is the responsibility of the Board to manage the health of the organization, the Personnel Committee has been meeting regularly and with increasing frequency over the past few months to figure out what we could do. We feel the crisis at Resist has not dissolved merely because Yana and Wechsler submitted their resignations. The personnel committee believes that the current crisis is the result of a combination of at least three factors: an organizational structure that places great responsibility on the staff to run day to day operations; lack of a director on site; and a lack of flexibility or the capacity among the staff to handle collective decision-making and problem-solving.

We accept our responsibility to alter whatever structural impediments exist that feed into the problems we experience. The Board is unwilling and unable to participate more actively in the day to day running of the office. The Board agrees with staff recommendations that a director is not appropriate for such a small staff. We have decided to restructure the Resist office to place more of a focus on the staff as a collective and to give two staff full time, equal status and full responsibility for the office management. In addition we would further adjust accountability procedures between the Board and the staff to make communication more successful and hopefully to prevent future emergencies of this scope.

We realize this decision has a powerful impact on all of you, and we hope you understand that we on the Board have also been profoundly affected. It is a struggle to maintain an alternative structure in a movement organization, and we ask your cooperation and support as we move through this period of transition.

Resist Board Meeting
May 18, 1995

Present: Hale, Chamberlain, Smith, O'Neil, Kampf (secretary); proxies: Scott, Ewing, Swerdlow, Lauter, Reagon, Rosemont, Brodhead, Goldsmith.

The Board met to consider the Personnel Committee's recommendations for addressing the current staffing issues.

I. The Resist Board decided that Resist's office operation needs to be restructured. To accomplish this, operation of the office will be put in partial suspension; the funding cycle scheduled for grant proposals for August 6, 1995 will be postponed until September 17, 1995.

II. The Board accepts the recommendation of outgoing staffers that Resist's staff should function as a collective. Given that it is neither desirable nor possible for the Board to supervise the daily operations of the staff, staffers will need the following qualifications in addition to such other functional qualifications as are required for their jobs:

a) an ability to work collectively, which involves being flexible, being able to work with others, showing good will to coworkers as well as the organization, doing multiple tasks, and being accountable to each other.

b) willingness to use office tools, keep time sheets, participate in staff meetings, and attend staff-board lunches.

c) willingness and ability to participate in peer evaluation, a necessary component of collective work.

d) recognition that the collective needs to be accountable to the Board. This can be done both through board meetings and through Board-staff lunches.

III. NEW STRUCTURE OF STAFF POSITIONS.

There will be two full time staff positions.

Position 1: Primary responsibility for fundraising and Newsletter

Position 2: Primary responsibility for grants-management and bookkeeping.
Secondary responsibility for Newsletter.

General administrative functions will be shared by the two people in a mutually agreeable fashion.

New job descriptions will be drawn up by the Personnel Committee.

Part-time positions are not expected to be necessary. However, if necessary, staff may bring proposals to hire part-time staff to the Board.

IV. A. The restructuring process will begin May 22, 1995.

B. We are giving employees notice that restructuring will occur over the Summer.

C. Nancy Moniz, who is the only regular employee, will be offered a choice of :

a. Two weeks of severance pay for every completed year of employment, i.e., 20 weeks. This will run from May 22, 1995 to October 6, 1995.

b. Moniz may work during all or part of the above period, and receive her normal benefits. In either case, her health care coverage will extend to October 6, 1995.

c. After October 6, 1995, Moniz will be eligible to apply for unemployment benefits.

D. Stefanie Poggi and Kate Gyllensvård

If they wish, they can continue to work during the restructuring period.

E. Temporary and full time staff are eligible to apply for the new positions.

F. Nancy Wechsler. After considering the relative costs of a lump sum payment or the subsequent costs of higher unemployment insurance, we will ask Nancy Wechsler not to file for unemployment, and give her a lump-sum payment instead. The lump-sum payment will be, at minimum, equivalent to the total sum of one cycle of unemployment benefits. During the restructuring period and for the remainder of 1995, Nancy Wechsler will be requested to be an inactive Board member, after which she may apply for active status on the Board, if she wishes.